



$I(J^P) = \frac{1}{2}(\frac{1}{2}^+)$  Status: \*\*\*\*

Neither  $J$  or  $P$  has actually been measured.

## $\Xi_c^0$ MASS

The fit uses the  $\Xi_c^0$  and  $\Xi_c^+$  mass and mass-difference measurements.

VALUE (MeV)	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
<b>2470.44<math>\pm</math>0.28 OUR FIT</b>		Error includes scale factor of 1.2.		
<b>2470.99<math>^{+0.30}_{-0.50}</math> OUR AVERAGE</b>				
2470.85 $\pm$ 0.24 $\pm$ 0.55	3.4k	AALTONEN	14B	CDF $p\bar{p}$ at 1.96 TeV
2471.0 $\pm$ 0.3 $^{+0.2}_{-1.4}$	8.6k	<sup>1</sup> LESIAK	05	BELL $e^+ e^-$ , $\gamma(4S)$
2470.0 $\pm$ 2.8 $\pm$ 2.6	85	FRABETTI	98B	E687 $\gamma$ Be, $\overline{E}_\gamma$ = 220 GeV
2469 $\pm$ 2 $\pm$ 3	9	HENDERSON	92B	CLEO $\Omega^- K^+$
2472.1 $\pm$ 2.7 $\pm$ 1.6	54	ALBRECHT	90F	ARG $e^+ e^-$ at $\gamma(4S)$
2473.3 $\pm$ 1.9 $\pm$ 1.2	4	BARLAG	90	ACCM $\pi^- (K^-)$ Cu 230 GeV
2472 $\pm$ 3 $\pm$ 4	19	ALAM	89	CLEO $e^+ e^-$ 10.6 GeV
<b>• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •</b>				
2462.1 $\pm$ 3.1 $\pm$ 1.4	42	<sup>2</sup> FRABETTI	93C	E687 See FRABETTI 98B
2471 $\pm$ 3 $\pm$ 4	14	AVERY	89	CLEO See ALAM 89

<sup>1</sup> The systematic error was (wrongly) given the other way round in LESIAK 05.

<sup>2</sup> The FRABETTI 93C mass is well below the other measurements.

## $\Xi_c^0 - \Xi_c^+$ MASS DIFFERENCE

VALUE (MeV)	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
<b>2.72<math>\pm</math>0.23 OUR FIT</b>		Error includes scale factor of 1.1.		
<b>2.91<math>\pm</math>0.26 OUR AVERAGE</b>				
2.85 $\pm$ 0.30 $\pm$ 0.04	5.1/3.4k	AALTONEN	14B	CDF $p\bar{p}$ at 1.96 TeV
2.9 $\pm$ 0.5		LESIAK	05	BELL $e^+ e^-$ , $\gamma(4S)$
7.0 $\pm$ 4.5 $\pm$ 2.2		ALBRECHT	90F	ARG $e^+ e^-$ at $\gamma(4S)$
6.8 $\pm$ 3.3 $\pm$ 0.5		BARLAG	90	ACCM $\pi^- (K^-)$ Cu 230 GeV
5 $\pm$ 4 $\pm$ 1		ALAM	89	CLEO $\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi^- \pi^+, \Xi_c^+ \rightarrow \Xi^- \pi^+ \pi^+$

## $\Xi_c^0$ MEAN LIFE

VALUE ( $10^{-15}$ s)	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
<b>153 <math>\pm</math> 6 OUR AVERAGE</b>		Error includes scale factor of 2.4.		
154.5 $\pm$ 2.4 $\pm$ 1.1	22k	<sup>1</sup> AAIJ	19AG LHCb	$\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow p K^- K^- \pi^+$
118 $^{+14}_{-12}$ $\pm$ 5	110	LINK	02H FOCS	$\gamma$ nucleus, $\approx$ 180 GeV
101 $^{+25}_{-17}$ $\pm$ 5	42	FRABETTI	93C E687	$\gamma$ Be, $\overline{E}_\gamma$ = 220 GeV
82 $^{+59}_{-30}$	4	BARLAG	90	ACCM $\pi^- (K^-)$ Cu 230 GeV

<sup>1</sup> AAIJ 19AG reports  $[\Xi_c^0 \text{ MEAN LIFE}] / [D^\pm \text{ MEAN LIFE}] = 0.1485 \pm 0.0017 \pm 0.0016$  which we multiply by our best value  $D^\pm \text{ MEAN LIFE} = (1.040 \pm 0.007) \times 10^{-12} \text{ s}$ . Our first error is their experiment's error and our second error is the systematic error from using our best value.

## $\Xi_c^0$ DECAY MODES

Mode	Fraction ( $\Gamma_i/\Gamma$ )	Scale factor
<b>Cabibbo-favored decays</b>		
$\Gamma_1 p K^- K^- \pi^+$	$(4.8 \pm 1.2) \times 10^{-3}$	1.1
$\Gamma_2 p K^- \bar{K}^*(892)^0, \bar{K}^{*0} \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$	$(2.0 \pm 0.6) \times 10^{-3}$	
$\Gamma_3 p K^- K^- \pi^+ (\text{no } \bar{K}^{*0})$	$(3.0 \pm 0.9) \times 10^{-3}$	
$\Gamma_4 \Lambda K_S^0$	$(3.0 \pm 0.8) \times 10^{-3}$	
$\Gamma_5 \Lambda K^- \pi^+$	$(1.45 \pm 0.33) \%$	1.1
$\Gamma_6 \Lambda \bar{K}^0 \pi^+ \pi^-$	seen	
$\Gamma_7 \Lambda K^- \pi^+ \pi^+ \pi^-$	seen	
$\Gamma_8 \Xi^- \pi^+$	$(1.43 \pm 0.32) \%$	1.1
$\Gamma_9 \Xi^- \pi^+ \pi^+ \pi^-$	$(4.8 \pm 2.3) \%$	
$\Gamma_{10} \Omega^- K^+$	$(4.2 \pm 1.0) \times 10^{-3}$	
$\Gamma_{11} \Xi^- e^+ \nu_e$	$(1.8 \pm 1.2) \%$	
<b>Cabibbo-suppressed decays</b>		
$\Gamma_{12} \Lambda_c^+ \pi^-$	$(5.5 \pm 1.8) \times 10^{-3}$	
$\Gamma_{13} \Xi^- K^+$	$(3.9 \pm 1.2) \times 10^{-4}$	
$\Gamma_{14} \Lambda K^+ K^- (\text{no } \phi)$	$(4.1 \pm 1.4) \times 10^{-4}$	
$\Gamma_{15} \Lambda \phi$	$(4.9 \pm 1.5) \times 10^{-4}$	

## CONSTRAINED FIT INFORMATION

An overall fit to 5 branching ratios uses 6 measurements and one constraint to determine 4 parameters. The overall fit has a  $\chi^2 = 1.4$  for 3 degrees of freedom.

The following *off-diagonal* array elements are the correlation coefficients  $\langle \delta x_i \delta x_j \rangle / (\delta x_i \cdot \delta x_j)$ , in percent, from the fit to the branching fractions,  $x_i \equiv \Gamma_i / \Gamma_{\text{total}}$ . The fit constrains the  $x_i$  whose labels appear in this array to sum to one.

$$\begin{array}{cc|cc} & & & \\ & & 68 & \\ & & 89 & 76 \\ \hline x_5 & & & \\ x_8 & & & \\ & & x_1 & x_5 \end{array}$$

## $\Xi_c^0$ BRANCHING RATIOS

### Cabibbo-favored ( $S = -2$ ) decays

$\Gamma(pK^- K^- \pi^+)/\Gamma_{\text{total}}$					$\Gamma_1/\Gamma$
VALUE (%)	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT	
<b>0.48 ± 0.12 OUR FIT</b> Error includes scale factor of 1.1.					
<b>0.58 ± 0.23 ± 0.05</b>	17 ± 5	LI	19A	BELL	$e^+ e^-$ at $\gamma(4S)$
$\Gamma(pK^- K^- \pi^+)/\Gamma(\Xi^- \pi^+)$					$\Gamma_1/\Gamma_8$
VALUE	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT	
<b>0.339 ± 0.035 OUR FIT</b>					
<b>0.34 ± 0.04 OUR AVERAGE</b>					
0.33 ± 0.03	1908 ± 62	LESIAK	05	BELL	$e^+ e^-$ , $\gamma(4S)$
0.35 ± 0.06	148 ± 18	DANKO	04	CLEO	$e^+ e^-$
$\Gamma(pK^- \bar{K}^*(892)^0, \bar{K}^{*0} \rightarrow K^- \pi^+)/\Gamma(\Xi^- \pi^+)$					$\Gamma_2/\Gamma_8$
VALUE	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT	
<b>0.14 ± 0.03 ± 0.01</b>		DANKO	04	CLEO	$e^+ e^-$
$\Gamma(pK^- K^- \pi^+ (\text{no } \bar{K}^{*0}))/\Gamma(\Xi^- \pi^+)$					$\Gamma_3/\Gamma_8$
VALUE	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT	
<b>0.21 ± 0.04 ± 0.02</b>		DANKO	04	CLEO	$e^+ e^-$
$\Gamma(\Lambda K_S^0)/\Gamma(\Xi^- \pi^+)$					$\Gamma_4/\Gamma_8$
VALUE	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT	
<b>0.21 ± 0.02 ± 0.02</b>	465 ± 37	LESIAK	05	BELL	$e^+ e^-$ , $\gamma(4S)$
$\Gamma(\Lambda K^- \pi^+)/\Gamma_{\text{total}}$					$\Gamma_5/\Gamma$
VALUE (%)	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT	
<b>1.45 ± 0.33 OUR FIT</b> Error includes scale factor of 1.1.					
<b>1.17 ± 0.37 ± 0.09</b>	24 ± 6	LI	19A	BELL	$e^+ e^-$ at $\gamma(4S)$
$\Gamma(\Lambda K^- \pi^+)/\Gamma(\Xi^- \pi^+)$					$\Gamma_5/\Gamma_8$
VALUE	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT	
<b>1.02 ± 0.15 OUR FIT</b> Error includes scale factor of 1.2.					
<b>1.07 ± 0.12 ± 0.07</b>	2979 ± 211	LESIAK	05	BELL	$e^+ e^-$ , $\gamma(4S)$
$\Gamma(\Lambda \bar{K}^0 \pi^+ \pi^-)/\Gamma_{\text{total}}$					$\Gamma_6/\Gamma$
VALUE	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT	
<b>seen</b>		FRABETTI	98B	E687	$\gamma$ Be, $\bar{E}_\gamma = 220$ GeV
$\Gamma(\Lambda K^- \pi^+ \pi^+ \pi^-)/\Gamma_{\text{total}}$					$\Gamma_7/\Gamma$
VALUE	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT	
<b>seen</b>		FRABETTI	98B	E687	$\gamma$ Be, $\bar{E}_\gamma = 220$ GeV
$\Gamma(\Xi^- \pi^+)/\Gamma_{\text{total}}$					$\Gamma_8/\Gamma$
VALUE (%)	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT	
<b>1.43 ± 0.32 OUR FIT</b> Error includes scale factor of 1.1.					
<b>1.80 ± 0.50 ± 0.14</b>	45 ± 7	LI	19A	BELL	$e^+ e^-$ at $\gamma(4S)$

$\Gamma(\Xi^-\pi^+)/\Gamma(\Xi^-\pi^+\pi^+\pi^-)$ 

<u>VALUE</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
<b>0.30±0.12±0.05</b>	ALBRECHT	90F ARG	$e^+e^-$ at $\gamma(4S)$

 $\Gamma_8/\Gamma_9$  $\Gamma(\Omega^-\kappa^+)/\Gamma(\Xi^-\pi^+)$ 

<u>VALUE</u>	<u>EVTS</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
<b>0.294±0.018±0.016</b>	650	AUBERT,B	05M BABR	$e^+e^- \approx \gamma(4S)$

 $\Gamma_{10}/\Gamma_8$  $\Gamma(\Xi^-e^+\nu_e)/\Gamma(\Xi^-\pi^+)$ 

<u>VALUE</u>	<u>EVTS</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
<b>1.3 ±0.8 OUR AVERAGE</b>				Error includes scale factor of 1.8.
3.1 ±1.0 <sup>+0.3</sup> <sub>-0.5</sub>	54	ALEXANDER	95B CLE2	$e^+e^- \approx \gamma(4S)$

0.96±0.43±0.18      18      <sup>1</sup> ALBRECHT      93B ARG       $e^+e^- \approx 10.4$  GeV

<sup>1</sup> This ALBRECHT 93B value is the average of the  $(\Xi^-e^+\text{ anything})/\Xi^-\pi^+$  and  $(\Xi^-\mu^+\text{ anything})/\Xi^-\pi^+$  ratios. Here we average it with the  $\Xi^-e^+\nu_e/\Xi^-\pi^+$  ratio.

 $\Gamma_{11}/\Gamma_8$  $\Gamma(\Xi^-e^+\nu_e)/\Gamma(\Xi^-\pi^+)$ 

<u>VALUE</u>	<u>EVTS</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
<b>1.3 ±0.8 OUR AVERAGE</b>				Error includes scale factor of 1.8.

 $\Gamma(\Lambda_c^+\pi^-)/\Gamma_{\text{total}}$ 

<u>VALUE</u> (units $10^{-3}$ )	<u>EVTS</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
<b>5.5±0.2±1.8</b>	6.3k	<sup>1</sup> AAIJ	20AH LHCb	$p\bar{p}$ at 13 TeV

 $\Gamma_{12}/\Gamma$ 

<sup>1</sup> AAIJ 20AH extracts  $B(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Lambda_c^+\pi^-)$  using two different normalization modes:  $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow pK^-\pi^+$  and  $\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow pK^-\pi^+$ . The mean value of both results, taking their correlations into account, is presented as the final result. The measurement assumes production fraction ratios  $f_{\Xi_c^0}/f_{\Lambda_c^+} = (9.7 \pm 0.9 \pm 3.1) \times 10^{-2}$  (from AAIJ 19AB plus heavy quark symmetry arguments) as well as  $f_{\Xi_c^0}/f_{\Xi_c^+} = 1.00 \pm 0.01$ . It further uses the inputs  $B(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow pK^-\pi^+) = (6.23 \pm 0.33) \times 10^{-2}$  and  $B(\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow pK^-\pi^+) = (4.5 \pm 2.1 \pm 0.7) \times 10^{-3}$  (from LHCb 19C). Its correlation with  $B(\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow pK^-\pi^+)$ , as measured in AAIJ 20AH, is 0.414.

 $\Gamma(\Xi^-\kappa^+)/\Gamma(\Xi^-\pi^+)$ 

<u>VALUE</u> (units $10^{-2}$ )	<u>EVTS</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
<b>2.75±0.51±0.25</b>	$314 \pm 58$	CHISTOV	13 BELL	$e^+e^- \approx \gamma(4S)$

 $\Gamma_{13}/\Gamma_8$  $\Gamma(\Lambda K^+K^-(\text{no } \phi))/\Gamma(\Xi^-\pi^+)$ 

<u>VALUE</u> (units $10^{-2}$ )	<u>EVTS</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
<b>2.86±0.61±0.37</b>	$510 \pm 110$	CHISTOV	13 BELL	$e^+e^- \approx \gamma(4S)$

 $\Gamma_{14}/\Gamma_8$  $\Gamma(\Lambda\phi)/\Gamma(\Xi^-\pi^+)$ 

<u>VALUE</u> (units $10^{-2}$ )	<u>EVTS</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
<b>3.43±0.58±0.32</b>	$316 \pm 54$	CHISTOV	13 BELL	$e^+e^- \approx \gamma(4S)$

 $\Gamma_{15}/\Gamma_8$

## $\Xi_c^0$ DECAY PARAMETERS

See the note on “Baryon Decay Parameters” in the neutron Listings.

### $\alpha$ FOR $\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi^- \pi^+$

VALUE	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
$-0.56 \pm 0.39^{+0.10}_{-0.09}$	138	CHAN	01	CLE2 $e^+ e^- \approx \Upsilon(4S)$

---

## $\Xi_c^0$ REFERENCES

AAIJ	20AH	PR D102 071101	R. Aaij <i>et al.</i>	(LHCb Collab.)
AAIJ	19AB	PR D99 052006	R. Aaij <i>et al.</i>	(LHCb Collab.)
AAIJ	19AG	PR D100 032001	R. Aaij <i>et al.</i>	(LHCb Collab.)
LI	19A	PRL 122 082001	Y.B. Li <i>et al.</i>	(BELLE Collab.)
LI	19C	PR D100 031101	Y.B. Li <i>et al.</i>	(BELLE Collab.)
AALTONEN	14B	PR D89 072014	T. Aaltonen <i>et al.</i>	(CDF Collab.)
CHISTOV	13	PR D88 071103	R. Chistov <i>et al.</i>	(BELLE Collab.)
AUBERT,B	05M	PRL 95 142003	B. Aubert <i>et al.</i>	(BABAR Collab.)
LESIAK	05	PL B605 237	T. Lesiak <i>et al.</i>	(BELLE Collab.)
Also		PL B617 198 (errat.)	T. Lesiak <i>et al.</i>	(BELLE Collab.)
DANKO	04	PR D69 052004	I. Danko <i>et al.</i>	(CLEO Collab.)
LINK	02H	PL B541 211	J.M. Link <i>et al.</i>	(FNAL FOCUS Collab.)
CHAN	01	PR D63 111102	S. Chan <i>et al.</i>	(CLEO Collab.)
FRAEBETTI	98B	PL B426 403	P.L. Frabetti <i>et al.</i>	(FNAL E687 Collab.)
ALEXANDER	95B	PRL 74 3113	J. Alexander <i>et al.</i>	(CLEO Collab.)
Also		PRL 75 4155 (erratum)	J. Alexander <i>et al.</i>	(CLEO Collab.)
ALBRECHT	93B	PL B303 368	H. Albrecht <i>et al.</i>	(ARGUS Collab.)
FRAEBETTI	93C	PRL 70 2058	P.L. Frabetti <i>et al.</i>	(FNAL E687 Collab.)
HENDERSON	92B	PL B283 161	S. Henderson <i>et al.</i>	(CLEO Collab.)
ALBRECHT	90F	PL B247 121	H. Albrecht <i>et al.</i>	(ARGUS Collab.)
BARLAG	90	PL B236 495	S. Barlag <i>et al.</i>	(ACCMOR Collab.)
ALAM	89	PL B226 401	M.S. Alam <i>et al.</i>	(CLEO Collab.)
AVERY	89	PRL 62 863	P. Avery <i>et al.</i>	(CLEO Collab.)

---